

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,872	02/08/2001	Shusou Wadaka	2565-0225P	9099
	7590 10/09/2002 WART KOLASCH & B	SIRCH	EXAM	INER
PO BOX 747	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ATTOMAST OF THE STATE OF THE ST	
	,		ART UNIT	EXAMINER BUDD, MARK OSBORNE RT UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2834
			2834	
			DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· V	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Λ
Office Action Summary	778872	Wadaka et	ol
omeo rionen ounmary	Examiner M. 12	Group Art Unit	
	<u> </u>	7637	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet be	eneath the correspondence add	dress—
Period for Reply	3		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAIL!	NG DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expected to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute 	y within the statutory minimuspire SIX (6) MONTHS from	um of thirty (30) days will be considered	I timely.
Status			
\times Responsive to communication(s) filed on $8-3-$	02		
This action is FINAL.			•
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935	or formal matters, prose C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	cution as to the merits is close	ed in
Disposition of Claims			
M Claim(s) 17- 62	Mand	is/are pending in the applic	
Claim(s) $17-62$ Of the above claim(s) $17-23$ and $41-63$	2 60 1-8-03	is/are pending in the applic	ation.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from cons	sideration.
\bigcirc Claim(s) \bigcirc		is/are allowed.	
,			
□ Claim(s)			
□ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————		are subject to restriction or requirement.	election
Application Papers		requirement.	
$\ \square$ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F	Review, PTO-948.		•
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved 🗆	disapproved.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	to by the Examiner.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)			
☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unde			
 □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the □ received. 	priority documents have	/e been	
□ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)			
□ received in this national stage application from the Intern	ational Bureau (PCT Ru	ule 1 7.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:			
Attachment(s)		•	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s	s) □ Int	erview Summary, PTO-413	•
□ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		erview Summary, P10-413 tice of Informal Patent Application	0 DTO 450
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948			
		her	
Office A	ction Summary		

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97) Application/Control Number: 09/778,872

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 24-33 and Are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as clearly anticipated by Krishnaswamy, Carran, Vale or Japan (804) for the specific reasons set forth in paper no. 6 (5-29-02).

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Japan (804), Vale or Krishnaswamy in view of Berlincourt for the explicit reasons noted in paper no. 6 (5-29-02).

Claims 35-39, 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy, Japan (804), Vale or Curran for the reasons stated in paper no. 6 (5-29-02).

Regarding applicants comments, claims 24-46 are drawn to an apparatus and not a method of making. The method of manufacture is not germaine to the patentability of apparatus claims.

Each of the references applied is a separate statutory bar to the patentability of claims 24-33 and 40 (35 U.S.C. 102). Limiting the number of applied references to four is not seen as an unreasonable burden and serves to reinforce the unpatentability of the claims.

Previously in the prosecution applicant argued that the prior art taught devices with the same properties on each wafer, now applicant argues they show different properties on the same wafer. Regardless, a wafer containing a pass band filter will have several different frequencies on that wafer. A wafer meant to be cut apart to form single resonators will have each resonator tuned to the same frequency. Which device is applicants apparatus limited to? Note again the method steps listed in these apparatus claims are not considered as limiting in the final structure.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/778,872

Art Unit: 2834

Claim 60 is directed to a method of manufacture and thus claim 60 and its dependent claims 17-23 are properly grouped with the other method claims 41-59. The method claims are withdrawn from further consideration.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

MARK LANDO PRIMARY EXAMINER ARTUNIT 212